| | Case 2:24-cv-01196-TLN-CKD Docume | nt 10 | Filed 02/12/25 | Page 1 of 2 | |
|----|--|-------|------------------|-------------|--|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | GEORGIA MILES, et al., | No. | 2:24-cv-01196-TL | N-CKD | |
| 12 | Plaintiffs, | | | | |
| 13 | v. | OR | DER | | |
| 14 | SUTTER COUNTY SHERRIFF, et al., | | | | |
| 15 | Defendants. | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | Plaintiffs Georgia Miles and Hiawatha Miles (collectively, "Plaintiffs") filed the above- | | | | |
| 18 | entitled action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 | | | | |
| 19 | U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. | | | | |
| 20 | On October 30, 2024, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which | | | | |
| 21 | were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and | | | | |
| 22 | recommendations were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. (ECF No. 8.) On November 12, | | | | |
| 23 | 2024, Plaintiff Georgia Miles filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 9.) | | | | |
| 24 | These objections have been considered by the Court. | | | | |
| 25 | This Court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which an | | | | |
| 26 | objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore | | | | |
| 27 | Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981); see also Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d | | | | |
| 28 | 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | |

| | Case 2:24-cv-01196-TLN-CKD Document 10 Filed 02/12/25 Page 2 of 2 | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | has been made, the Court assumes its correctness and decides the matter on the applicable law. | | | | |
| 2 | See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's | | | | |
| 3 | conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d | | | | |
| 4 | 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). | | | | |
| 5 | The Court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing, | | | | |
| 6 | concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the findings and recommendations in full. | | | | |
| 7 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: | | | | |
| 8 | 1. The Findings and Recommendations (ECF No. 8) are ADOPTED IN FULL; | | | | |
| 9 | 2. Plaintiffs' claims are DISMISSED without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civi | | | | |
| 10 | Procedure 41(b); and | | | | |
| 11 | 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. | | | | |
| 12 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | | | |
| 13 | Date: February 10, 2025 | | | | |
| 14 | TROY L. NUNLEY | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 27 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |